



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

teacher whose long and lovely life illustrated the dignity and excellence of the truth, old as the morning and as ever fresh, that fidelity to the divine law written upon the conscience is the only safe law of life for every man"?

O. B. Rhodes

Adams, N. Y.

*How to Study and Teach History.* With Particular Reference to the History of the United States. By B. A. HINSDALE, PH. D., LL. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. pp. xxii+346.

One of the latest acquisitions of the *International Education Series*, is Professor Hinsdale's *How to Study and Teach History*. The title is not strikingly novel; neither is there anything in the book alarmingly radical or revolutionary. The work is a straight forward setting forth of the value and scope of the study of history, with practical suggestions as to method. The author has also placed a large field of literature under contribution, and in small compass presents the results not only of his own study and experience, but also of prominent educators and historians. The book is therefore of real value, not only to the teacher of history but to the student as well.

The question whether history should have a place in the educational curriculum, is no longer in the courts. It has taken us here in America some time to discover the old world. The doctrine of evolution is as important to the student of history and to the student of natural science. So long as American educators acquiesced in the popular conviction that we owe the natives of the old world little and have still less to expect from them; that they rather are our debtors having everything to learn from us, it was difficult to impress upon university boards or even university faculties, that outside of the barest outline, European history had much for the American student. The landing of Mary Chilton on Plymouth Rock was of far more importance in the progress of the world, than the landing of William and his fighting barons on the Pevensey coast in 1066. The wars of Pequods and Naragansetts, or the interminable palavers of Mohawks and Dutchmen were of far more importance in an educational way, than the majestic strifes of Roman pope and German emperor or the wrestle of the commons of France with their feudal lords for civic liberty.

We have now, however, at the close of the fifth century after Columbus, discovered the old world. We of the new world are neither the last nor the greatest creation of Omniscient Wisdom. Omnipotence has not after all exhausted itself in the creation of the "universal Yankee nation". All the generations of men have not wandered into darkness, that we alone might have light. Our place is not before the footlights with the audience

but on the stage with the players. We are not the centre of the circle, but only a small arc of an exceedingly great circumference, that sweeps away behind us into eternities that are past, and away before us into eternities that are to come.

The history of the old world, it is now recognized, has a grave significance for the American student. Our own history is little and insignificant, compared with that greater field beyond the Atlantic. And yet, as we are the heirs of all the past, the youngest born and yet the eldest of nations, that old world history is also our history—our pre-natal history if you please. America is great, but the world outside of America is greater. America has a noble future, but the race, of which America after all is only a fragment, has a nobler future. Nor is it too much to say, that any accurate comprehension of what we are, any sense of the possibility of the future, is unattainable without a knowledge of the past history of the European society,—our own history before the days of Columbus.

Moreover, there are other pleas to be made for the larger interpretation of the term history as found in our curricula, and not of least importance, is the direct educational value of the action upon mind and character of contact with great, true souls in the struggles and in the achievements of the past. Nor are the failures of the past without instruction, or wholesome influence. If in some way or other, the first chapters of Professor Hinsdale's work on the educational value of the study of history, could be brought into contact with the wingless minds of some faculties, a lasting obligation would be conferred upon the teachers of history, who through years have been struggling to obtain a proper recognition for this subject in college and preparatory school.

It is not enough, however, that the teacher have in mind the general object of the study of history. He must also place before himself some definite and specific object which he seeks to attain with any given class and in any given topic. This object will be determined by the age, progress, and even number of pupils. The means within the teacher's grasp, library facilities for instance, his own previous training, and attainments, time at the teacher's disposal not only in class work but for his own private study will also enter into the solution of the problem. The clear apprehension of this special object, will go a long way in determining the method which the teacher will adopt in any given case.

In this connection, it is certainly to be deprecated that in accordance with our American fondness for large things, there is a tendency to introduce more advanced methods, and more advanced subjects by immature teachers to immature pupils. Thus the "*seminar*" turns up in strange places." The protest of this author is timely. Such teaching will not only fail to teach historye

but must also dissipate the intellectual strength of the student, and disgust him with both teacher and subject.

All methods therefore are not equally good. Some as the "topical method", so-called, are to be ruled out entirely. Other methods are good at certain stages of the student's progress, but are to be condemned out of proper time and place. The "seminary method" always sounds well,—to those who do not know what the seminary is. For graduate work, it is an ideal method, but for less advanced pupils it is perilous, to say the least. It certainly ought not to be introduced by teachers, who themselves have not had some practical training in research. It is too often resorted to by teachers, under the mistaken idea, that in this way the students will do most of the work and least will be exacted of the teacher. Yet no method is so exacting upon the teacher or requires so much in the way of general and special preparation.

Of the utmost importance is it therefore, that the teacher take a practical view of his position. He should study his limitations and adapt himself and his methods accordingly. In this connection, the suggestions of Professor Hinsdale relative to elementary instruction are invaluable.

The object of the present writing is not criticism but rather to call attention to an exceedingly valuable book. One might wish that some lines had been cut deeper, for example, that even more emphasis had been placed upon civil or political history, as the peculiar province of the teacher of history, while the history of literature, or of art and architecture, or of philosophy and religion should be left to the departments concerned. More emphasis might also have been placed upon the use of original documents, and the necessity of bringing the student face to face with the sources, that he may gain his knowledge first hand. But perhaps for the present at least, this is expecting too much of the teacher in the way of training, or scholarly ability. Too many teachers have no such knowledge of themselves. It would puzzle them, perhaps, even to name the chief sources of a period through which they have conducted classes for years. One also feels like raising a question as to the author's estimate of the value of the historical novel; or of the relative merits for the purposes of historical study, of such writers as Freeman and Macaulay, or Froude and Stubbs. In the author's comparison of these writers, there seems to be a lurking taint of the idea, that only that is valuable in education which is interesting. But in scientific research, what is meant by this word *interesting*? To one imbued with the spirit of the true student, the driest fact that leads to the discovery of truth, is interesting. The student of history,—and the teacher should always be a student,—who is not drawn to his work, fascinated by it, for its own sake, for the truth's sake; but who must have his work tempered by the rosy

glow from some brilliant imagination other than his own, before he can be interested, is as unfitted for the study of history as a blind man for the study of astronomy. To say the least, some of us have been in the habit of calling such writers as Freeman, Stubbs, Waitz, and others that might be mentioned, historians, while Froude, and Scott we have relegated to the world of polite literature. They are brilliant and useful in their way, but about as helpful to the student of history as colored glasses to a biologist. Macaulay to be sure, reigns in a limbo all his own, where the two worlds meet. He certainly belongs both to history, and to literature, but to the searcher along the dark ways of the past, a light so dazzling that it blinds, is surely not the safest guide.

B. S. Terry

University of Chicago

*The Private Life of the Romans.* By HARRIET WATERS PRESTON and LOUISE DODGE. The Students' Series of Latin Classics. Boston: Leach, Shewell, & Sanborn, 1893.

The conception of this book was an exceedingly happy one. It is a symptom of the growing tendency in our schools and colleges to emphasize the humanistic as opposed to the formal side of classical studies. Moreover it is a recognition of the necessity for an orderly and systematic study of the subject of private antiquities, as opposed to the chance gleanings of cursory reading.

The execution too of the book has much to commend it. We recognize the same lucidity of expression and charm of style which have won admiration for the other literary work of these gifted and accomplished women. Yet with all this it is questionable whether they have not made a mistake in giving us a compilation from Marquardt and Friedländer instead of the mature fruit of a profounder study of the whole field of which they treat. The book, as it is, will undoubtedly be useful and stimulating; yet we miss that sureness of touch and accuracy in details, which are so important in a book intended for school and college use. Minor slips are frequent and some serious errors occur.

Thus the cut of a "bath from an ancient painting" given on p. 49 ill becomes a book which is professedly based on Marquardt. It is Marquardt's merit to have exposed the fraudulent character of this illustration, and to have shown that it goes no further back than a sixteenth century MS.

On p. 64 the *toga praetexta* is described as "a simple woollen tunic (!) with a broad purple stripe (*clavus latus*) down the front." Of course the toga was not a tunic, nor was the *toga praetexta* distinguished by a purple stripe down the front, but on the contrary by a purple border, as is correctly stated on p. 12. The same confusion of toga and tunic is continued on p. 65 by reference to